PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet) Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220 International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) PCT/GB2004/005050 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C09D11/00, C09D11/10				PCI		
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/SA/220 FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	see form PCT/ISA/220			INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORIT		
See paragraph 2 below					e form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)	
PCT/GB2004/005050 02.12.2004 20.12.2003 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC						
Applicant AVECIA LIMITED 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. Basis of the opinion		•		ay/month/year)		
Applicant AVECIA LIMITED 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industance applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application			national classification a	nd IPC		
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: □ Box No. □ Basis of the opinion □ Box No. □ Priority □ Box No. □ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicabili □ Box No. □ Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. □ Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. □ Certain documents under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or indus applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. □ Certain documents cited □ Box No. □ Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. □ Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply with applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority of whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	9D11/00, C09D11/1	·U				
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: □ Box No. □ Basis of the opinion □ Box No. □ Priority □ Box No. □ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicabili□ Box No. □ Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. □ Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or indus applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. □ Certain documents cited □ Box No. □ Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. □ Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. □ Reasoned for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply with the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.						
Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or indus applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply with the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/SA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority of whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/SA/220.						
□ Box No. II Priority □ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicabili □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or indus applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply with applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority of whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	This opinion conf	tains indications	relating to the follo	wing items:		
 □ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability. Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or indus applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply with the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 	⊠ Box No. I €	Basis of the opinio	n			
Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or indus applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply will the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority of whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	☐ Box No. II F	Priority				
Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or indus applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 7. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply with the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 <i>bis</i> (b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority of whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	☐ Box No. III 1	Non-establishmen	t of opinion with rega	rd to novelty, inventi	ve step and industrial applicability	
applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply with applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority of whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.						
□ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply with the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	☑ Box No. V F	Reasoned stateme applicability; citation	ent under Rule 43 <i>bis.</i> ons and explanations	1(a)(i) with regard to supporting such sta	novelty, inventive step or industrial tement	
Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply will the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	☐ Box No. Vi (Certain documents	s cited			
2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply with the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority of whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	☐ Box No. VII (Certain defects in	the international app	lication		
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply what the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	☐ Box No. VIII (Certain observatio	ons on the internation	al application		
written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply with the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	FURTHER ACTIO	N				
submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of the months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	written opinion of t the applicant choo International Bures	the International P oses an Authority o au under Rule 66.	Preliminary Examining other than this one to	, Authority ("IPEA"). be the IPEA and the	However, this does not apply where e chosen IPEA has notifed the	
	submit to the IPEA months from the d	A a written reply to date of mailing of F	ngether, where approx	oriate, with amendm	ents, before the expiration of timee	
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.	For further options	s, see Form PCTA	SA/220.			
	For further details	, see notes to For	m PCT/ISA/220.			
Name and mailing address of the ISA: Authorized Officer						

European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Ellrich, K

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8295



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

10/583709 International application No. PCT/GB2004/005050

			iapzorational jun 2006
	Вох	No. I	Basis of the opinion
1.	With the	rega angu	rd to the language , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in age in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
		langu	opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following lage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search er Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2.	With	rega essan	rd to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and y to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a. ty	pe of	material:
		⊐ a	sequence listing
		∃ ta	ble(s) related to the sequence listing
	b. fo	rmat	of material:
) in	written format
	0] in	computer readable form
	c. ti	me of	filing/furnishing:
] c	ontained in the international application as filed.
	[3 fil	ed together with the international application in computer readable form.
	[∃ fu	rnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.		has to	Idition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional es is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as opriate, were furnished.
4.	Add	litiona	I comments:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-19

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-19

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims No: Claims 1-19

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/GB2004/005050

Re item V:

Reference is made to the following document/s/:

D1: US-B1-6 550 905 (DECKERS BERNARD J) 22 April 2003 (2003-04-22)

D2: WO 99/29788 A (XAAR TECHNOLOGY LIMITED; JOHNSON, STEVE; WOODS, JILL) 17 June 1999 (1999-06-17)

D3: US 2003/199655 A1 (YURUGI KEIJI ET AL) 23 October 2003 (2003-10-23)

D4: US-B1-6 593 390 (JOHNSON STEVE ET AL) 15 July 2003 (2003-07-15)

1. Art. 33(2) PCT:

D1 discloses (claim 15, examples, abstract) solvent-free ink jet inks containing colorants and 20-40%wt monofunctional acrylates, 35-55% diacrylates and 5-15% triacrylates (leading to values of formula (1) below 60). The inks of D1 are disclosed to be curable without photoinitiators (Col. 12, I. 4, Col. 8, I. 19 and Col. 7, I. 50).

Consequently, the subject-matter of claims 1-19 is anticipated by D1.

D2 discloses (claim 1) solvent-free ink jet inks containing colorants and >20% monofunctional acrylates, >17,5% diacrylates and 10-30% triacrylates the total amount of acrylates being at least 35% (leading to values of formula (1) below 60). The inks of D2 are disclosed to be curable without photoinitiators by electron beam (p. 5, l. 14).

Consequently, the subject-matter of claims 1-19 is anticipated by D2.

2. Art. 33(3)PCT:

Providing an amended main claim which meets the requirements of Art. 33(2)PCT, the applicant should relate the distinguishing feature to a surprising (unexpected) technical effect or make credible or plausible that said difference is not derivable from the prior art teaching.